its salubrity; the attention we pay to the comforts of the humbler classes of our fellow citizens; the care we take of the education of the rising generation,—are sentences constantly in our mouths. Gladly would the nation sacrifice in any manner, to effect, really, an amelioration in any of these objects, we may safely and proudly assert. Yet either from ignorance or from carelessness we allow the existence of a state of things, in the very heart of London, which is a shame and a disgrace to any Christian land,—which spreads around in every direction the seeds of physical pestilence,—and gives rise to a moral degradation more awful still.

Have any of the readers of this article ever visited the streets and lanes in the neighbourhood of Smithfield? It is to be feared that there are not many bold enough to expose themselves to the sight of the accumulation of horrors there congregated. If there had been many so bold, our Government would certainly never have dared to allow the money lately spent upon the public improvements, to have been employed merely to make clean the outside of the cup and the platter, whilst the inside still remains so full of ravening wickedness. For we have within a musket-shot of the great thoroughfares of Holborn and King-street,—within the district, in fact, bounded by those streets to the south and east, by the market itself and Goswell-street to the north and east, by Clerkenwell and Field-lane on the north and west,—a collection of abominations, the mere recollection of which is enough to make the gorge rise. Narrow streets,—badly paved, worse drained; houses ill-built, rotten, damp, and falling to pieces; the entries below the level of the street, so that the drainage takes place inwards instead of outwards; no privies worthy even of that name; and in the midst of all this misery and filth, every now and then we find a private slaughter house, a knacker's yard, a tripe-boiler's, a fat-melter's, or a sort of stall to receive the animals for the next market. Children swarm in the midst of these sights and scenes; for it appears to be a law of nature that our race should develop itself with the greatest prolificness under circumstances of the greatest misery. And here we,—we who talk and boast of the care we take of the children of the poor,—allow them to wallow in the blood and filth of these most foul and disgusting operations; we allow them to accustom themselves to sights and scenes which make blood, suffering, and death objects of daily and hourly occurrence. What are we entitled to expect from a population thus contaminated? Should any great political convulsion upset the elaborately artificial system of our society, and drag us through the horrors of a revolution, it is amongst them that the future Dantons will seek the instruments willing and able to commit the crimes and butcheries they may order. In the interest of society then, if not from a higher motive, it behoves us to examine whether some remedy cannot be found for the present awful state of this neighbourhood; and, when once found, the pressure from without must be employed to make the Government fulfil its duty to a class of society so long neglected, and remove a nuisance which can but become greater as the City of London increases in wealth and importance.

Presented thus, the questions to be solved are,—Firstly, whether the state of the neighbourhood might not be much improved without displacing the market? Secondly, whether, the market removed, the nuisances would cease? Thirdly, what new organization would be necessary to insure the supply of butchers' meat for the London market, and the most favourable conditions for the maintenance of the public health?

The first two questions, by implication, involve the examination of the advisability of retaining the market in its present position,—because, if it be shown that a market in the middle of a town is necessarily accompanied by a series of grievous nuisances, its removal is the first object to be aimed at.

Now, it is an undoubted fact that the neighbourhood of Smithfield might be immensurably improved, even though the market were maintained. What takes place therein is shocking enough, but a mere cattle-market does not necessarily imply a dangerous state of public health. To get the cattle to and from Smithfield exposes them doubtlessly to much torture; the narrow space they are forced into, and the means adopted to make them crowd together, doubtlessly cause much pain and suffering to the animals; the absence of water in summer, the filthy mud they stand in in winter, doubtlessly aggravate their sufferings. But we in England only punish cruelty in detail. Mr. Martin's Act can reach a costermonger who ill-treats his donkey; it is powerless to force the City to find the room necessary to prevent the cruelty to thousands of bullocks, exposed every week. And so the grazier has to suffer by the loss of weight of his animals—the public is forced to consume a description of meat which cannot be in its normal condition of healthiness. This is a sad tale, but it might exist without the accompaniment of the sadder tales told by the neighbourhood; for, at the market of Sceaux, near Paris, which also is too small for the number of cattle exposed, much cruelty prevails. Moreover, it is to be observed that there are parts of London removed from Smithfield, which are as foul as that sink of all that is disgusting; for instance, Whitechapel, Rotherhithe, and the Follies of Southwark. There is, then, no absolute connection between the market and the nuisances around it; they may both enjoy their sad celebrity in perfect independence of one another. But there is an important remark to be made—namely, that a market always is accompanied by a peculiar set of annoyances, which depress the value of the property in its neighbourhood, and which, by so much, encourage the establishment of certain industries, which would not be tolerated in other localities. Now, as our police only acts *ex post facto*, and upon the complaint of injured parties, it is almost impossible to prevent the concentration of nuisances in such localities. In France, where it is necessary to have a license to open a building or establishment devoted to a trade of a nature to annoy the neighbourhood, it is easy to control not only their location, but the conditions of salubrity in which they are erected. We have no such control, and it may admit of question whether, after all, the results obtained by our defective police in these matters are not as satisfactory as those obtained by the elaborate one in force in France. Be that as it may, it is certain that much might be done (and it is a foul shame upon the corporation that it still remains to be done) to improve the neighbourhood of Smithfield. The drainage and the paving of the streets are surely things easily improved: some means might be devised to open new lines of communication, to widen existing thoroughfares; but, above all, some regulations should be adopted to enforce the observance of the laws of common decency in the different slaughter-houses and bone-shops of these now-unnoticed localities. It is not too much to assert that hardly one of these establishments is constructed upon the principles of drainage, ventilation, or supply of water now universally received as being necessary to ensure the healthy state of the neighbourhood in which they are situated.

Secondly. As to the question whether the market being removed the nuisances would cease, what has been said above may be applied here. There is no inevitable connection between the two, their separate and independent existences may therefore well continue. But it is more than probable that many of these unwholesome industries would disappear if the market were removed. For instance, the cattle-layers would of course accompany the new market; the low lodging and public-houses would cease to receive their present tenants; the class of people who would succeed them, in all probability, would be better—they cannot be worse; and, by degrees, the foul industries of the quarter would be forced to observe better regulations. We are not justified in saying that the removal of the market will inevitably cause the nuisances, now agglomerated round it, to cease; but every reason exists to induce us to believe that insensibly they would do so. At any rate, their degree of concentration would be less.

Subsidiarily, we may observe, that the connection between the market and the abominations which surround it is so great, that the latter may almost be regarded as the consequences of holding the former in its present position. The market diminishes the value of the property in the neighbourhood; it facilitates the establishment of industries which are carried on under conditions unfavourable to public health; it agglomerates a poor, corrupt population in quarters fit only to aggravate their poverty and their corruption. No respectable man, with any degree of refinement of taste, could live near Smithfield. The ground is, therefore, left open to those whose trades require contiguity thereto. Slaughter-houses, cattle layers, tripe boilers, knacker's yards, flourish in the precincts of the great market for the sale of the articles on which their owners work. We may, therefore, hold the market responsible for the abominations of its neighbourhood; and even were it not itself a cause of unnecessary cruelty to the animals, and of loss to the graziers, we should be justified in calling loudly for the removal of a nuisance which is a shame and a blot upon any civilized country.

Thirdly, we have to consider what new organization would be necessary to secure the supply of butcher's meat for London, and the regulations connected with this matter it would be advisable to adopt in the interest of the public health. This involves an examination of the regulations to be enforced in the cattle market, the slaughtering and converting of the carcases.

There are numerous schemes abroad for choosing a substitute for Smithfield, which have as many opponents as admirers. Some are for transferring it (the market) to Islington, some to King's-cross. But both these schemes are based upon what is in no way proved—the necessity for concentration. They are, moreover, only means of shifting the question. Both Islington and King's-cross are already surrounded with houses. London is "going out of town" in both directions. We shall soon find that the same evils will spring up there that we complain of in the present locality. Besides, if the market be still kept in London, why move it? The dwellers of that part of the town appear to have grown to the filthy state in which they live; why force others to undergo such a seasoning? Islington and King's-cross will soon be as densely inhabited as Clerkenwell, or even the City. Between two crowded localities there can be little reason to choose, beyond the fact of the one having for years enjoyed the monopoly of the nuisance. If any change be made, it must be by removing the market altogether out of London,—to Romford, to Finchley, to Hanwell, or to Croydon; perhaps by establishing markets at all these points on different days of the week. The cattle bought at these markets might then be brought to the different slaughter-houses, or to the different butchers' shops, should they prefer to kill upon their own premises. Rules for the sanitary condition of the slaughter-houses should be drawn up, and no operations of this nature should be allowed to be carried on but in places licensed to that effect, the license to be granted by a board of magistrates upon a report of a district surveyor. If the slaughter-houses be well built, there need be no restriction as to the neighbourhood in which they are to be established; of course, care being taken to remove them from the immediate contact of the public. But the tallow melting shops, the tripe dealers, and the bone burners, as they give rise to foul miasmas, so they should not be allowed to work in the midst of the usual population of a large city. After some years the forced use of public slaughter-houses might become law; but as a transition, the butchers might retain the right to slaughter at home, the more especially as their own interest would soon make them prefer the large establishments, where the necessary sanitary conditions are so much more easily attained.

The substitute for Smithfield is, after all, the most difficult part of the question. As to the slaughter-houses, the results obtained upon the continent from their adoption have been so remarkable, their success so perfect, both as commercial speculations and as guarantees for the public health, that nothing but the desperate obstinacy our organised bodies invariably oppose to the adoption of anything foreign, can account for their not being applied in England. But the question of the new market is far from being as simple. In fact, a central market, inasmuch as it brings in contact a vast number of buyers and sellers, ren-

To learn more about PDF Compression and OCR go to ThePaperlessOffice.org